

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/965,808

Applicant(s)

POCOCK, MICHAEL

Examiner

Reuben M. Brown

Art Unit

2623

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Reuben M. Brown.

(3) _____

(2) Ray Persino.

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 29 March 2007.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.


Identification of prior art discussed: Larsen & Wezynowicz.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


REUBEN M. BROWN
PATENT EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Agreed that the combination of references would not read on when the broadcast identifier is not the same as the identification of a broadcast signal source. Discussed applicant's position that Larsen is a matching technique, instead of actually identifying the TV broadcast (signal source). Also, applicant argues that Larsen is directed to searching for content, as opposed to broadcast source. Applicant also argues that Wegrzynowicz operates by routing, instead of creating a subset of data as claimed Examiner's position is that in Larsen, the user inputs the 'broadcaster', which corresponds with the claimed broadcast identifier. Also, the claimed identifying feature corresponds with the 'matching'.